

In a short address, made by Prof. Lorenz at a reception tendered him by a number of prominent

**PROF. LORENZ
AND HIS CLAIM.**

surgeons in New York, the plea for "bloodless" orthopedic surgery was put forth and strongly urged on the assumption, stated as fact, that it places the life of the patient in less jeopardy than does "bloody" surgery. In fact, Prof. Lorenz, particularly in his talks at clinics in the East, has more and more strongly urged this claim of lessened danger as one of the principal advantages of the "bloodless" operations. Viewing the question entirely dispassionately, it seems well to ascertain, if possible, whether the advantage claimed is founded on fact, or whether it is more conjectural than real. Given a healthy patient—one not suffering from local or general infection—and the dangers attendant upon any recognized surgical operation performed under strict aseptic conditions are confined to "surgical shock" and death from anesthetic, both of which untoward possibilities have been reduced to a minute percentage in recent years. In practically all cases in which bloodless orthopedic surgery is recommended, or can be practiced, the patients are healthy in the sense that they have no local nor general infection. The anesthetic is a common factor—is necessarily employed in bloodless as well as in bloody operations; there remains "surgical shock," and the question as to whether the shock is greater when a quick, clean incision is made through resistant tissues, or when these tissues are stretched, torn and mauled by the unseeing hands of the operator. There is some evidence tending to substantiate the belief that somewhat more shock is produced by the, let us say, "strenuous" manipulations required in bloodless operations than is caused by bloody operations. Prof. Lorenz does not seem to be justified in claiming lessened danger to the life of the patient for his operations. Whether or not the claim of better results is well founded, will be demonstrated in due course, and is, intentionally, not here discussed.

Fifty-three members of the State Medical Society owe \$320 for dues. Almost half of this

**INEXCUSABLE
DELINQUENCY.**

number reside in San Francisco, within easy reach of the Secretary's office. A fair proportion of them are in the habit of keeping a little in arrears all the time. Just why this condition of affairs should exist is difficult to say. But the amount is considerable for the State Society to lose. It may be that these members are financially unable to meet their obligations. This is probably the case in a certain number of instances, when it would be only right that the Society should remit the dues, if the Secretary were informed of the fact.

Under the old Constitution and By-Laws a member in arrears to the amount of two years' dues could be dropped from the membership roll. Provision for dealing with delinquents was, however, overlooked by the committee who had the revision of our Constitution in charge. There being no way of dealing with these members, it becomes a matter of personal honor with each of them. If they will not pay the Society what they owe, of course they will be privileged to retain their membership by virtue of membership in an affiliated County Society. We do not think there is a member in the State Society, or the medical profession in California, who would adopt this method of repudiating a debt. A considerable number, however, remain delinquent because they are too careless to send in the amount of their dues, notwithstanding the fact that communication after communication has been sent to them by the Secretary, 807 Sutter Street.

Every periodical in which advertisements are published assumes a double responsibility; on the one hand to the subscribers, who presumably read its pages of text, and on the other hand to its advertisers,

**THE JOURNAL
ADVERTISERS.**

who look for advantage through being presented to the notice of the readers. In no case does a publisher *guarantee* to an advertiser any enhanced sales; there is no obligation save that of assuring a certain circulation—a specified number of subscribers. Some publishers do not consider that they have any moral responsibility in the matter of advertising, and consequently accept whatever is offered, so long as it is paid for; others recognize the fact that their subscribers may be swindled through the false claims of unscrupulous manufacturers or dealers, and therefore exercise a more or less rigid censorship of the advertising matter submitted. This journal, being the official publication of the Medical Society of the State of California, will see to it that, so far as it may be humanly possible, both the members of the Society and the advertisers of the JOURNAL, are protected; the former from appeals to make use of unethical preparations, and the latter from the injury which comes from corrupt association. The JOURNAL will endeavor to publish advertisements only of honest and reliable firms. In the case of remedial agents or preparations, the exact quantity of the active ingredients must be known or published, and no obviously extravagant claims for impossible therapeutic value will be permitted. Any one who is induced to purchase something advertised in the pages of the JOURNAL, and who finds that the article is not what it was therein represented to be, will confer a favor upon the Publication Committee and the editor by promptly reporting all the facts.